

Anonymous 1

Page 1 of 1

1/04.01	<p>The LLNL has many severe problems arising out of its history and that of the national government. However, there is one overwhelming problem - we have no mission. The cold war is over, we won, pack up - go home. (Note how in your mission question you had to state the mission). Stockpile Stewardship (SBSS) is the new Y2K hoax, a real but relatively small problem blown up to attempt to justify the 'business as usual' atmosphere at the LLNL. NIF is hush money for the test ban treaty; note how it was so important but delays of 5-10 years don't seem to matter. Without a pressing mission we are battered about by trendy movements (Diversity - something the lab knows nothing about, Safety, Security, Computer Security, Personal Security, lie detectors...) without shielding or leadership from management. While I am personally discouraged by the behavior of laboratory management most of us could simply ignore the foibles if we had a clear and meaningful mission. I believe the LLNL management should congratulate us on a job well done in maintaining a credible nuclear defense during the cold war, acknowledge the world has changed, develop the programs to retire and/or transfer employees to Los Alamos, and turn over the facility to California for a new UC, UC Livermore.</p>
2/32.05	<p>Cundor - there are many problems and serious issues at the LLNL - they are barely acknowledged (and this is a marked improvement) by our management. You cannot fix a problem you will not acknowledge. Under the guise of being 'an optimist' or a 'positive person' our management does not admit to failures nor deal with the consequences. For example, ISM is an immense failure - we employees know now - if you get hurt get off site. Reams of paperwork have been generated, the IWS etc. When I reported a legitimate safety concern (road conditions) it was first ignored, when I pressed the system the response degenerated into a passing contest between departments as to who might pay and for the last two years nothing has been done. When I reported a serious breach of security (assault rifles brought in in visitors vehicles) I was told there would be no investigation because 'it would embarrass the laboratory'. We get Newsline, a propaganda sheet which never covers the real issues at the Laboratory (Mike Campbell's departure [which for many of us crushed our hopes for the LLNL's future], the termination of AVLIS, etc). We have Science and Technology Review - a glossy on our claimed successes. As a 25 year employee I never worked on a project which eventually succeeded. Perhaps we should have a glossy on our 'High Risk' ventures and their true outcomes - this glossy could be monthly and mammoth. Finally we have Fitnotes from the folks who can run a Yuppie Toy Store but can't run a daycare facility. Two items symbolize a major laboratory problem. In building 111 the elevators only stop at certain floors; in HR the last time I was there several years ago there was a locked glass door barring access to a number of the offices.</p> <p>Having seen the LLNL bookmark we devoted ourselves to determining what are the strengths at the LLNL.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The retirement system - this is why my contemporaries are staying put. And the pay isn't bad. 2. The best toys - we can order the latest and fastest computers and other toys (opps! - analysis tools) we think we need, money is really no object. Then in September comes 'end of the year' money where we can buy whatever we want whether we need it or not. 3. Low pressure, the deadlines are not real, neither are the budget constraints (look at NIF). We have no time critical missions; we may pay lip service to 'on time, under budget' but we (and our sponsors to some extent) understand the vagaries of high tech, high risk work. 4. Flex time - we can come and go as we please - maybe one week sixty hours, the next week thirty. 5. Education - we can take courses and training is well supported 6. Travel - we can go many places with minimal justification. 7. Job security 8. No matter how bad we screw up there is always Los Alamos. <p>Q. What is the difference between the LLNL and the Titanic? A. The Titanic had a band.</p>
1/04.01 cont.	<p>The LLNL did help to win the cold war - our contributions were real. That our product was not used is the crowning achievement of mankind in the 20th century. We helped to make this occur. Now we must find a mission of comparable importance for the next century. Perhaps that mission is here at the LLNL, perhaps the mission is to let our people go to where they can be productive. No more 'business as usual'; time for management to give way to leadership.</p>

Anonymous 2

Page 1 of 4

1/32.03	<p>The Space Preservation Treaty (SPT) accompanies the US Space Preservation Act, HR 3657 introduced into Congress in December 2003 by Congressman and Presidential Candidate Dennis Kucinich. The SPT incorporates the best language and intention of previous space treaties and treaty proposals including the ABM Treaty and the 1967 Outer Space Treaty. The SPT is ready to be signed by world leaders into world law at the Space Preservation Treaty-signing Conference in early 2005. It will do the following:</p> <p>*Prohibit the research and development (R&D), testing, manufacturing, production and deployment of space-based weapons and systems, and the use of weapons to destroy or damage objects in space that are in orbit (i.e. satellites). This prohibits the introduction of all operational weapons in space, and the escalation of war on earth from space and in space.</p> <p>*Permit space exploration, R&D, testing, manufacturing, production and deployment of civil commercial and defense activities (including communication, navigation, surveillance, reconnaissance, early warning or remote sensing-including asteroid and comet hazard mitigation) that is not related to space-based weapons or systems.</p> <p>*Transform the war industry into a space industry and other industries by removing the mandate to weaponize space while simultaneously allowing the inexorably linked military-industrial-entrepreneurial-lab-university-intelligence-NASA (and other space agencies and organizations)-government(s) complex to continue to expand into space, but without space-based weapons.</p> <p>*Stimulate a new economic package and creates a new marketplace as humans evolve from earth into space generating more jobs and education/training programs, and more contracts and profits than during any hot or cold wartime. Space R&D and exploration programs are the foundation for a win-win platform that is feasible and realistic, and that will produce clean and safe Space Age technology, products and services that will be applied, with focus and intention, directly to solving urgent and potential problems of human needs, new energy, and a sustainable environment and development. This will transform the war-based economy, industry and mindset into a Space Age economy, industry, and mindset, creating a new Space Age paradigm vision of what IS and CAN BE.</p>
	<p>*Build a strong national and global defense and security system based on bringing the world, including "adversaries" with different cultures and perspectives, together for benefits all. It will get the world's leaders to commit to cooperation and healthy competition through agreements to 1) ban all space-based weapons and 2) apply civil, commercial, military/defense, and entrepreneurial Space Age technology and information services to enhance worldwide cooperation in communication and information exchanges about vital issues of human needs, new energy, and our environment. 3) stop space-based technology being used as "force multipliers" to enhance war capabilities. 4) use space technology to observe earth so that we can preserve our common environment and protect all life, to see where the sick waters are so we can clean them up, to see where suffering people are so troops and civil workers can supply food and medicines, clean water systems and alternative energy sources, 5) provide satellite programs to educate (healthcare, etc.) and eliminate poverty and suffering. 6) apply security based on respect for our unity and diversity, with compassion for everyone on a different place on life's path; 7) bring us together to reap the abundance of benefits and opportunities that will improve life as we recognize we are interconnected earth-in-space species in the universe. 8) Promote Peace on Earth as it is in Space = real security.</p> <p>* Stop the weaponization of space. The Space Preservation Treaty simply removes the mandate to weaponize space and identifies new roles for the militaries and military budgets, for corporations and corporate profits. It will reform and improve intelligence and defense departments to focus R&D, technology, applications and information services to protect humanity, produce new energy and resources and preserve our environment. The SPT will create a Space Age way of thinking. The militarization of space has occurred, but not the weaponization of space.</p>

Anonymous 2
Page 2 of 4

1/32.03
cont.

* Initiate new ways of thinking and acting. The SPT implies that militarization of space is different from militarization on earth. The SPT eliminates operational weapons of mass destruction (WMDs). In fact, the 300 Astronauts, Cosmonauts and specialists report that they surprise each other in space. They cooperate and work as friends on duties and challenges, not as earth adversaries. They seem to be initiating a new era of cooperation beyond their ego-based, fear-based cultures on earth. When the ban on space-based weapons becomes law, humans can evolve with a vision to replace the war mindset and war industry with space industry. In the Space Age we can embrace the concept of eliminating war and developing peace and real security for the militaries, the corporations and people on earth and in space. We can employ Space Age technology and information to bring the world together without weapons. The Space Preservation Act and the World Peace Treaty pave the way to peace on earth.

*Verify and enforce agreements. When the first twenty U.N. Member Nations sign and ratify the world Space Preservation Treaty it will become world law. And, an important new entity will be formed. A cooperative world Outer Space Peacekeeping Agency will be established and equipped to monitor outer space and enforce the space-based weapons ban. The same Space Age equipment will be applied with the intention--not to enhance war fighting capabilities even under the guise of calling it "defense"-- but instead to verify agreements. This includes reducing and eliminating missiles (and eliminating the need for "missile defense"), nuclear weapons, and other WMDs, toxins and polluting technology.

*Free brains and budgets, hearts and souls to live, work and travel freely together on earth, as well as peacefully in space. For the past 40 years the defense industry and those of several countries have been planning space-based battle stations, pop-up space-based weapons and Star Wars flying shooters and bombers.

Yet IMAGINE/1 Other NASA futurists and defense analysts have led the way with visions and models of space habitats, schools, hospitals, hotels, resorts, farms, labs, industries, elevators, crafts and telepathic robots beyond Spirit and Opportunity. IMAGINE putting the lid on the war industry! IMAGINE happy, healthy lives filled with culture, music and the arts. IMAGINE air and space travel without intimate wands and taking off shoes. We are evolving the speed and breadth of our intelligence and can think and act in the context of a new Space Age paradigm. We can speak and act with understanding, compassion, and peace and justice for all. We can respect our diversity and different perspectives, acknowledging our interconnectedness, with love and caring that will provide a wonderful, healthy future for our children, for all children and grandchildren...and for all life here and beyond.
But do more than IMAGINE. Get these two SIGNED: THE SPACE PRESERVATION ACT OF HR 3657 AND the world SPACE PRESERVATION TREATY!

Anonymous 2
Page 3 of 4

1/32.03
cont.

SPACE PRESERVATION RESOLUTION FOR _____ CITY COUNCIL

City Council of the City of _____
Date: _____

RESOLUTION NUMBER _____

To: The President and Members of the City Council of the City of _____

Subject: ENDORSING THE SPACE PRESERVATION ACT (HR3657) AND COMPANION SPACE PRESERVATION TREATY TO BAN PERMANENTLY THE WEAPONIZATION OF SPACE

RECOMMENDATION: That the City Council of the City of _____ pass the attached resolution supporting the US Space Preservation Act (HR3657) and the companion world Space Preservation Treaty, and request that the President of the City Council of the City of _____ send letters to our federal representatives urging their support of the Space Preservation Act (HR3657).

BACKGROUND: On December 8, 2003, U.S. Congressman Dennis Kucinich (D-Ohio) introduced the Space Preservation Act (HR3657), companion to the world Space Preservation Treaty, into the US House of Representatives. In the words of Congressman Kucinich, "We can take this technology for destruction, for war, and, through this proposal, create a technology for peace. We can create a world where war no longer becomes inevitable. We first have to look to a practical measure, such a measure to stop the weaponization of space. There are so many opportunities for the evolution of our species. There is the possibility of space travel, for commerce, for exploration. That is part of the human spirit. It always has been. And so we have the chance today, launching this effort for peace, through saying, 'There shall be no weapons in space.' But not only that, but to use the legislation as a matrix for a treaty to preserve space which we will ask leaders from all over the world to sign."

Please see attached Resolution.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS: NONE

CONTACT ALDERMAN: _____ Tel: _____

City Council of the City of _____

RESOLUTION NO. _____

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE SPACE PRESERVATION ACT (HR3657) AND THE SPACE PRESERVATION TREATY TO BAN PERMANENTLY THE WEAPONIZATION OF SPACE

WHEREAS, the Space Preservation Act (HR3657) and the companion Space Preservation Treaty will establish a permanent ban on all space-based weapons, on the use of weapons to destroy or damage objects in space that are in orbit; and the permanent termination of research and development, testing, manufacturing, production and deployment of all space-based weapons; and

WHEREAS, the termination of the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty on June 13, 2002 will permit research, development, testing, manufacturing, production and deployment of space-based weapons, thereby instigating a dangerous, costly, and destabilizing arms race in space, endangering all residents of the City of _____, the United States of America and all of humankind, and invading outer space, humanity's weapons-free common heritage, with space-based weapons; and

WHEREAS, The US Space Preservation Act, companion to the world Space Preservation Treaty, introduced by U.S. Congressman Dennis Kucinich (D-Ohio), requires the U.S. President to work toward "negotiating, adopting and implementing an international treaty banning space-based weapons and the use of weapons to destroy or damage objects in space that are in orbit;" and

WHEREAS, the Space Preservation Treaty will establish an outer space peacekeeping agency to monitor

of 2

4/77/2004 9:58 AM

Anonymous 2
Page 4 of 4

outer space and enforce the permanent ban of space-based weapons; and

WHEREAS, The Space Preservation Act (HR3657) and the Space Preservation Treaty facilitate future public and private investment in clean and safe technology, products and services, and in sustainable, non-weapons, expanded civil, commercial and military, world cooperative space ventures, and the consequent stimulation of the national and world economy. The Space Preservation Act (HR3657) and the Space Preservation Treaty do not prohibit activities including space exploration, space research and development, testing, manufacturing or deployment that is not related to space-based weapons or systems, or civil, commercial, or defense activities (including communications, navigation, surveillance, reconnaissance, early warning, or remote sensing) that are not related to space-based weapons or systems;" and

1/32.03 WHEREAS, the Space Preservation Act (HR3657) and the Space Preservation Treaty preserve the peaceful, cont. cooperative uses of space for all residents of the City of _____ and for all humankind; and

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF _____:

1) THAT IT IS THE WILL OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF _____ THAT THE U.S. SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ENACT AND THE U.S. PRESIDENT SIGN AND ENFORCE THE SPACE PRESERVATION ACT (HR3657); and

2) THAT IT IS THE WILL OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF _____ THAT THE U.S. PRESIDENT, INDIVIDUALLY OR AT A SPACE PRESERVATION TREATY CONFERENCE, SIGN THE SPACE PRESERVATION TREATY, AND THAT THE U.S. SENATE RATIFY IT TO PERMANENTLY BAN ALL SPACE-BASED WEAPONS TO PRESERVE THE COOPERATIVE, PEACEFUL USES OF SPACE FOR ALL RESIDENTS OF THE CITY OF _____ AND FOR ALL HUMANKIND; and

3) THIS RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF _____ IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED TO BE ADOPTED BY ALL MUNICIPALITIES IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND WORLDWIDE.

of 2

4/27/2004 9:58 AM

Anonymous 3
Page 1 of 3

■ UP to Atomic Bomb: Decision
 ■ UP to Leo Szilard Online

A PETITION TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Source: U.S. National Archives, Record Group 77, Records of the Chief of Engineers, Manhattan Engineer District, Harrison-Bundy File, folder #76.

On July 17, 1945, Leo Szilard and 69 co-signers at the Manhattan Project "Metallurgical Laboratory" in Chicago petitioned the President of the United States.

July 17, 1945

A PETITION TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Discoveries of which the people of the United States are not aware may affect the welfare of this nation in the near future. The liberation of atomic power which has been achieved places atomic bombs in the hands of the Army. It places in your hands, as Commander-in-Chief, the fateful decision whether or not to sanction the use of such bombs in the present phase of the war against Japan.

1/32.02 We, the undersigned scientists, have been working in the field of atomic power. Until recently, we have had to fear that the United States might be attacked by atomic bombs during this war and that her only defense might lie in a counterattack by the same means. Today, with the defeat of Germany, this danger is averted and we feel impelled to say what follows:

The war has to be brought speedily to a successful conclusion and attacks by atomic bombs may very well be an effective method of warfare. We feel, however, that such attacks on Japan could not be justified, at least not unless the terms which will be imposed after the war on Japan were made public in detail and Japan were given an opportunity to surrender.

If such public announcement gave assurance to the Japanese that they could look forward to a life devoted to peaceful pursuits in their homeland and if Japan still refused to surrender our nation might then, in certain circumstances, find itself forced to resort to the use of atomic bombs. Such a step, however, ought not to be made at any time without seriously considering the moral responsibilities which are involved.

The development of atomic power will provide the nations with new means of destruction. The atomic bombs at our disposal represent only the first step in this direction, and there is almost no limit to the destructive power which will become available in the course of their future development. Thus a nation which sets the precedent of using these newly liberated forces of nature for purposes of destruction may have to bear the responsibility of opening the door to an era of devastation on an unimaginable scale.

If after this war a situation is allowed to develop in the world which permits rival powers to be in uncontrolled possession of these new means of destruction, the cities of the United States as well as the cities of other nations will be in continuous danger of sudden annihilation. All the resources of the

<http://www.dannen.com/decision/45-07-17.html>

4/27/2004

Anonymous 3

Page 2 of 3

1/32.02
cont.

United States, moral and material, may have to be mobilized to prevent the advent of such a world situation. Its prevention is at present the solemn responsibility of the United States -- singled out by virtue of her lead in the field of atomic power.

The added material strength which this lead gives to the United States brings with it the obligation of restraint and if we were to violate this obligation our moral position would be weakened in the eyes of the world and in our own eyes. It would then be more difficult for us to live up to our responsibility of bringing the unloosened forces of destruction under control.

2/04.01

In view of the foregoing, we, the undersigned, respectfully petition: first, that you exercise your power as Commander-in-Chief, to rule that the United States shall not resort to the use of atomic bombs in this war unless the terms which will be imposed upon Japan have been made public in detail and Japan knowing these terms has refused to surrender, second, that in such an event the question whether or not to use atomic bombs be decided by you in light of the considerations presented in this petition as well as all the other moral responsibilities which are involved.

Leo Szilard and 69 co-signers

Signers listed in alphabetical order, with position identifications added:

1. DAVID S. ANTHONY, Associate Chemist
2. LARNED B. ASPREY, Junior Chemist, S.E.D.
3. WALTER BARTKY, Assistant Director
4. AUSTIN M. BRUES, Director, Biology Division
5. MARY BURKE, Research Assistant
6. ALBERT CAHN, JR., Junior Physicist
7. GEORGE R. CARLSON, Research Assistant-Physics
8. KENNETH STEWART COLE, Principal Bio-Physicist
9. ETHALINE HARTGE CORTELYOU, Junior Chemist
10. JOHN CRAWFORD, Physicist
11. MARY M. DAILEY, Research Assistant
12. MIRIAM P. FINKEL, Associate Biologist
13. FRANK G. FOOTE, Metallurgist
14. HORACE OWEN FRANCE, Associate Biologist
15. MARK S. FRED, Research Associate-Chemistry
16. SHERMAN FRIED, Chemist
17. FRANCIS LEE FRIEDMAN, Physicist
18. MELVIN S. FRIEDMAN, Associate Chemist
19. MILDRED C. GINSBERG, Computer
20. NORMAN GOLDSTEIN, Junior Physicist
21. SHEFFIELD GORDON, Associate Chemist
22. WALTER J. GRUNDHAUSER, Research Assistant
23. CHARLES W. HAGEN, Research Assistant
24. DAVID B. HALL, position not identified
25. DAVID L. HILL, Associate Physicist, Argonne
26. JOHN PERRY HOWE, JR., Associate Division Director, Chemistry
27. EARL K. HYDE, Associate Chemist
28. JASPER B. JEFFRIES, Junior Physicist, Junior Chemist
29. WILLIAM KARUSH, Associate Physicist
30. TRUMAN P. KOHMAN, Chemist-Research
31. HERBERT E. KUBITSCHKEK, Junior Physicist

<http://www.dannen.com/decision/45-07-17.html>

4/27/2004

Anonymous 3

Page 3 of 3

32. ALEXANDER LANGSDORF, JR., Research Associate
33. RALPH E. LAPP, Assistant to Division Director
34. LAWRENCE B. MAGNUSSON, Junior Chemist
35. ROBERT JOSEPH MAURER, Physicist
36. NORMAN FREDERICK MODINE, Research Assistant
37. GEORGE S. MONK, Physicist
38. ROBERT JAMES MOON, Physicist
39. MARIETTA CATHERINE MOORE, Technician
40. ROBERT SANDERSON MULLIKEN, Coordinator of Information
41. J. J. NICKSON, [Medical Doctor, Biology Division]
42. WILLIAM PENROD NORRIS, Associate Biochemist
43. PAUL RADELL O'CONNOR, Junior Chemist
44. LEO ARTHUR OHLINGER, Senior Engineer
45. ALFRED PFANSTIEHL, Junior Physicist
46. ROBERT LEROY PLATZMAN, Chemist
47. C. LADD PROSSER, Biologist
48. ROBERT LAMBURN PURBRICK, Junior Physicist
49. WILFRED RALL, Research Assistant-Physics
50. MARGARET H. RAND, Research Assistant, Health Section
51. WILLIAM RUBINSON, Chemist
52. B. ROSWELL RUSSELL, position not identified
53. GEORGE ALAN SACHER, Associate Biologist
54. FRANCIS R. SHONKA, Physicist
55. ERIC L. SIMMONS, Associate Biologist, Health Group
56. JOHN A. SIMPSON, JR., Physicist
57. ELLIS P. STEINBERG, Junior Chemist
58. D. C. STEWART, S/SGT S.E.D.
59. GEORGE SVIHLA, position not identified [Health Group]
60. MARGUERITE N. SWIFT, Associate Physiologist, Health Group
61. LEO SZILARD, Chief Physicist
62. RALPH E. TELFORD, position not identified
63. JOSEPH D. TERESI, Associate Chemist
64. ALBERT WATTENBERG, Physicist
65. KATHERINE WAY, Research Assistant
66. EDGAR FRANCIS WESTRUM, JR., Chemist
67. EUGENE PAUL WIGNER, Physicist
68. ERNEST J. WILKINS, JR., Associate Physicist
69. HOYLANDE YOUNG, Senior Chemist
70. WILLIAM F. H. ZACHARIASEN, Consultant

Source note: The position identifications for the signers are based on two undated lists, both titled "July 17, 1945," in the same file as the petition in the National Archives. From internal evidence, one probably was prepared in late 1945 and the other in late 1946. Signers were categorized as either "Important" or "Not Important," and dates of termination from project employment were listed in many cases. It is reasonable to conclude that the lists were prepared and used for the purpose of administrative retaliation against the petition signers.


Copyright Notice: The original of this document is believed to be in the public domain. Its transcription and formatting as an e-text, however, is copyright 1995-1998 by Gene Dannen (gene@dannen.com).


<http://www.dannen.com/decision/45-07-17.html>

4/27/2004

Anonymous 4

Page 1 of 1

 **Draft Site-wide Environmental Impact Statement
for Continued Operation of Lawrence Livermore
National Laboratory and Supplemental Stockpile
Stewardship and Management Programmatic
Environmental Impact Statement
U.S. Department of Energy
National Nuclear Security Administration**

 **NNSA**
National Nuclear Security Administration

Written Comment Form
Must be received on or before May 27, 2004.

To: Ponder:

1/32.02 ① We cannot simultaneously prepare for
and prevent WAR.

② War is terrorism with a larger budget.

③ From Pope Krishna's The Biological Basis of
Religion and Genes: p. 9 "Gandhi taught a
way of political struggle which ruled out any
means not in keeping with the desired goal;
he believed that a nonviolent state can be
reached only by nonviolent means. But
the linear, causal manner of technological
thinking sharply distinguished between ends
and means... The dissolution of reality into
a network of causal chains is a mistake. A
culture which misunderstands reality that
way destroys the very reality it intends to control
and improve."

2/32.04

Please use other side if more space is needed.

Comment forms may be mailed to:
Mr. Tom Grim
Document Manager
National Nuclear Security Administration
Livermore Site Office, L-293
7000 East Avenue
Livermore, CA 94550-9234

Comment forms may be faxed to: (or "liberate"
Mr. Tom Grim
(925) 422-1776
as in Balluzak,
Inq.)
tom.grim@oak.doe.gov

www-environfo.llnl.gov

925-422-0704
877-388-4930

Balestreri, Joe
Page 1 of 1

Joe Balestreri
6568 Lucas
Oakland, CA 94611

May 20, 2004

Mr. Tom Grim
DOE, NNSA L-293
7000 East Ave.
Livermore, CA 94550

Dear Mr. Grim:

Please consider this letter with my comments on the environmental and proliferation risks from proposed nuclear weapons development and new plutonium and tritium programs at the U.S. Department of Energy's (DOE) Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL).

1/03.01 I oppose the use of my tax money for the creation of weapons of mass
2/04.01 destruction. This includes the nuclear and biological weapons programs
proposed for LLNL. The development of these weapons clearly poses a
significant risk to the people and environment of Berkeley. But more
importantly, the hypocrisy of the US pursuing these technologies even as
we condemn and destroy other nations for seeking them undermines our
credibility and security. They should not be made anywhere.

Thank you,

Joe Balestreri

Barrett867 (email moniker)
Page 1 of 1

-----Original Message-----

From: Barrett867@aol.com [mailto:Barrett867@aol.com]

Sent: Monday, April 26, 2004 2:16 PM

To: tom.grim@oak.doe.gov

Subject: Comment on Livermore lab proposal

1/04.01

Just want to express my disagreement with the proposed changes to the Livermore lab as it applies to Plutonium and Tritium, etc. as I am unable to attend any of the public hearings to express my concerns.

Thank you.

Bauer, Peter
Page 1 of 1

RE: Comments on the Department of Energy's Site-Wide Environmental Impact Statement (SWEIS) for Continued Operations at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL).

Dear Mr. Grim:

- 1/33.01, 15.01 | 1. Go ahead and double the limit for plutonium at Livermore Lab from 1,540 pounds to 3,300 pounds. Additionally, under the Proposed Action, the administrative limit for highly enriched uranium in Building 239 would increase from 55 pounds to 110 pounds. The Seven million people live in surrounding areas need jobs!
- 2/34.01, 33.01 | 2. The SWEIS proposes to increase the at-risk limits for tritium ten fold, from just over 3 grams to 30 grams. The SWEIS proposes to increase the at-risk limit for plutonium from 44 pounds to 132 pounds. It is not unsafe to increase the amount of tritium and plutonium that can be "in process" in one room at one time. LLNL has a history of no violations with plutonium and releases of both tritium and plutonium, making it evident that these amounts should be increased.
- 3/27.01 | 3. This plan will revive a project that was canceled more than 10 years ago. The project was called Plutonium - Atomic Vapor Laser Isotope Separation (AVLIS). Now it is called the "Integrated Technology Project"(ITP) and the "Advanced Materials Program"(AMP). This is a scheme to heat and vaporize plutonium and then shoot multiple laser beams through the vapor to separate out plutonium isotopes. The ITP / AMP is not a health risk and the ITP and AMP work should go ahead.
- peter bauer
114 mission ave
sr ca

Bault, William
Page 1 of 1

Dear DOE:

Here is my comment on the draft Site-Wide Environmental Impact Statement on Livermore Lab operations over the next ten years. The SWEIS calls for major increases in nuclear weapons design and manufacture. New plutonium activities include: raising the inventory from 1,540 pounds to 3,300 pounds; tripling the amount "at risk" at one time; creating prototype bomb cores for a new "Modern Pit Facility;" fissioning plutonium in the NIF mega-laser; and, vaporizing plutonium oxide on-site to separate isotopes. The SWEIS also reveals plans to increase the "at risk" limit for radioactive tritium 10-fold. EPA has labeled this area as a Super Fund Site. I oppose these actions in the SWEIS that will increase nuclear proliferation and damage our environment. I call on you to analyze conversion of the Lab to peaceful purposes as an alternative.

Signed:

W. Bault
WILLIAM BAULT
3454 1/2 St. N. #100
Nevada City CA 95959



To: 00660

RECEIVED MAY 13 2004
Mr. Tom Grim
DOE, NNSA, L-293
7000 East Avenue
Livermore, CA 94550

1/24.02 |
2/01.01
3/04.01
4/07.01

Bell, Pastor Bonnie
Page 1 of 1

Sincerely,
Alex Baxter

Pastor Bonnie Bell

Berkey, Andrea and Family
Page 1 of 1

Andrea Berkey
557 Tyler Avenue
Livermore, CA 94550

May 3, 2004

Mr. Tom Grim, DOE, NNSA, L-293, 7000 East Ave., Livermore, CA 94550

Dear Sir:

I am a new resident of Livermore. I chose this area because as a new mother I wanted to live in an area that would provide me with a sense of security and future for my new family. I have enjoyed Livermore's pleasant atmosphere, friendly neighbors and local activities. My children enjoy the warm weather and local parks. They love running in the sprinklers in the summer and playing in the rain in the winter.

1/17.04 | Lately however, I have been increasingly nervous about the area in which I live. I am very unsettled by the news I hear regarding Lawrence Livermore Lab. I now question whether living next to a facility that has been known to release radioactive material into the air is wise. I understand that

2/18.02 | Tritium binds to water molecules readily, and thus makes the rain in the area a threat. What about the ground water, is the water we drink contaminating our bodies?

3/18.01 | The question of whether or not to allow Lawrence Livermore Lab to increase its stock of hazardous materials and biological agents, in my mind is mute. How on earth can we justify the potential hazards of radioactive, testing, shipping, storing, handling, and waste? Some may say it's for National Security, and the common good. Tell me, what good is National Security, if National Security is not fighting the everyday threat to our own children's health? Should I think it better to have Livermore contaminated by the plague, or sprinkled by radioactive rain showers in the pursuit of the common good? Where is my future of health, happiness and realization of the American dream?

4/23.01, 30.01 | Which then becomes of grater importance; the possibility of a terrorist threat or the very real danger the lab plays in my children's everyday lives? I now am afraid of the water we drink, the hose that my children turn on to play with, and the possibilities of the negative effects to my children's long term health. Three older women on my block have suffered from cancer, and four men have been diagnosed with Parkinson's Disease. That seems like a pretty high percentage for my area wouldn't you agree?

5/35.01 | Please think of my beautiful, smart, healthy children when the decision is made to import these biohazards into our community. Remember, Lawrence Livermore lab is in the heart of a wonderful strong community, full of vibrant young people who deserve a clean bright future too.

Sincerely,
Andrea Berkey and Family

Billings, Susan
Page 1 of 1

Susan Billings
7621 Levison Ave
El Cerrito CA 94530

4/25/03

Dear Mr. Grim,

1/04.01 | I am writing in opposition to the Dept. of Energy's recently released SWEIS for Livermore Labs planned operation for the next ten years. This plan calls for doubling the amount of plutonium allowed for Livermore. It poses a threat to the health & safety of all of us living in the bay area.

2/33.01 | This plan also calls for resuming underground testing of nuclear weapons.

3/23.01 | This poses a threat to the entire world, and has the potential to start a new nuclear arms race.

4/39.01 | This is a terrible plan.

1/04.01 | Sincerely, Susan Billings

cont.